

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Lawrence L. Crawford, *a/k/a Jonah Gabriel*,
a/k/a Jahjah T. Tishbite, a/k/a Jahjah Al
Mahdi, a/k/a the King of the North,

PLAINTIFF,

v.

Judge J. Newman, Director Bryan Stirling,
Dorm Manager Lt. Reed, General Counsel
Annie Rumler, Capt. Brighthard, Warden
Williams, Barton Vincent,

DEFENDANTS.

Case No. 9:19-cv-01400-TLW

Order

Plaintiff Lawrence L. Crawford, proceeding *pro se*, brings this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 1. Plaintiff is currently an inmate at the Lieber Correctional Institution, part of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. In his lengthy Complaint, the Plaintiff alleges generally that the Defendants have conspired against him. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 28.

In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that this case be dismissed. The magistrate judge found that the Plaintiff fails to include sufficiently clear factual allegations against any of the named Defendants of any personal responsibility or personal wrongdoing in connection with the alleged violation of any of the Plaintiff's constitutionally protected rights. After the magistrate judge filed the Report, Plaintiff filed objections. ECF No. 34. The objections provide no legal or factual basis to reject the recommendations of the magistrate judge. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the Report, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections.... The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and the objections, for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report, ECF No. 28, is **ACCEPTED**. Plaintiff's objections, ECF No. 34, are **OVERRULED**. Plaintiff's Complaint, ECF No. 1, is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Senior United States District Judge

May 18, 2020
Columbia, South Carolina